![Gmail](M Gmail)   **fitri maya puspita <pipitmac140201@gmail.com>**

ID# 1570637230: Preparing paper for a Scopus indexed journal caliber
4 messages

ts@ee.uad.ac.id <ts=ee.uad.ac.id@edas.info>   Sat, Dec 5, 2020 at 10:43 AM
Reply-To: ts@ee.uad.ac.id
To: Fitri Maya Puspita <pipitmac140201@gmail.com>
Cc: Angelo Bruno <angelo.bruno@ieee.org>, Noriko Etani <kerotan@kcn.ne.jp>, Kai Liu <liukai.v@gmail.com>, Mahmood
Mosleh <drmahmoodfarhan@gmail.com>, Ali Nahar <alikareemnahar79@gmail.com>, "Alexander B. Sergienko"
<sandy@ieee.org>, Dhiraj Sunehra <dhirajsunehra@yahoo.co.in>, Baohua Yang <yangbaohua@gmail.com>, Yingjie Zhang
<superzyj001@qq.com>, Qi Zhao <qi.zhao@cs.ucla.edu>, esperg@ee.uad.ac.id

-- LAST REMINDER !!!

-- **YOU MUST UPLOAD YOUR FINAL MANUSCRIPT** AFTER THIS EMAIL REACHED YOU, EVEN IF YOU HAVE
PREVIOUSLY UPLOADED IT.

-- PLEASE ENSURE the **SIMILARITY SCORE is less than 25%**. Any paper with **a similarity score of more than 25%
will be DROPPED/REJECTED for publication**

-- Please refer to: http://citei.intconference.org/list-of-accepted-papers-and-registration/ and see at "Revisions Required"
column.

-- This email is addressed to authors of the papers in this list.

-- Please adhere strictly and use the templates:

-->> IJEECS: http://iaescore.com/gfa/ijeecs.docx (Word Format)

-->> IJAI: http://iaescore.com/gfa/ijai.docx (Word Format)

-->> IJERE: http://iaescore.com/gfa/ijere.docx (Word Format)

-- Checklist for preparing your final paper for publication: http://ijeecs.iaescore.com/index.php/IJEECS/about/
editorialPolicies#custom-3 or http://ijai.iaescore.com/index.php/IJAI/about/editorialPolicies#custom-2

-- Please re-upload your updated paper for possible publication in one of our Scopus indexed journals through EDAS
system (https://edas.info/index.php?c=27031) before **DECEMBER 10, 2020** (NOT BY EMAIL) <<<----- URGENT ---
otherwise, we will not proceed your paper

Dear Dr. Fitri Maya Puspita,

Your paper is selected for publication in one of our Scopus indexed journals (see: http://citei.intconference.org/list-of-
accepted-papers-and-registration/). Congratulations!! However, we regret to inform you that after Editorial Board Meeting
and careful re-review, many revised papers are still poorly presented and not good contribution enough for Scopus
indexed journal caliber. Your paper ID #1570637230, entitled "Models of Improved Multilink Reverse Charging Network by
Utilizing the Bit Error Rate QoS Attribute" requires **REVISIONS** before being scheduled for publication in one of Scopus
indexed journals. We suggest for **EXTENSION** and **IMPROVEMENT** on **RESULTS** and **DISCUSSION/ANALYSIS** of your
paper. You are asked to seriously & carefully revise your current paper version, and do re-upload your final manuscript
through EDAS (only), according to:

- Reviewers' comments,
- Editors' comments,
- Editorial office comments (see http://citei.intconference.org/list-of-accepted-papers-and-registration/, see
  comments at "Revisions Required" column), and
- The guidelines for authors.

- Most importantly, please ensure the **similarity score is less than 25% (by iThenticate of Turnitin software)**.

Then, the editors will re-check whether your updated final manuscript is already addressed to the comments and guidelines, and fulfill for a Scopus indexed journal standard. Failing to do proper revisions may lead to **cancel/reject/drop/disqualify** your paper for publication without refund. So, please take your attention for the requirements.

The reviews are below or can be found at https://edas.info/showPaper.php?m=1570637230, using your EDAS login name pipitmac140201@gmail.com.

Please upload your updated final manuscript through CITEI'20 EDAS system (https://edas.info/index.php?c=27031) **before DECEMBER 10, 2020** (submission by email is ignored). Please avoid to submit your revised paper through other platform/site or email. If you have submitted your updated paper directly to IJEECS/IJAI/IJERE EDAS system, please withdraw it.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Best Regards,

Assoc. Prof. Tole Sutikno, Ph.D.
General Chair, 2020 1st Conference on Internet of Things and Embedded Intelligence

Editor-in-Chief, Indonesian Journal of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science
Managing Editor, IAES International Journal of Artificial Intelligence

COMMENTS FROM REVIEWERS:

Full paper review 1

Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.

Good (4)

Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.: completeness of the analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour.

Excellent work and outstanding technical content. (5)

Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.

Significant original work and novel results. (4)

Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.

Well written. (4)

Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

The strong aspect is the capacity of this study to become a model usable by ISP to manage better their link resources to give the right QoS.

Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

The quite complex formulas and number of variables and parameters in chapter 3.

Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

May be that chapter 3 could be more clear if the 3 cases:

α and β as parameters α as Parameter and β as Variable α and β Variables

will be three separated sub-chapter, this in my opinion will clarify the contents of the Analysis.

May be that if one ISP practical example will be added for each case this will be useful.

Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

Yes

Full paper review 2

Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.

Little (2)

Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.: completeness of the analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour.

Marginal work and simple contribution. Some flaws. (2)

Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.

Minor variations on a well investigated subject. (2)

Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.

Substantial revision work is needed. (2)

Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

Multi-variable analysis of ISP profits.

Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

1. The paper looks as a slightly modified version of another paper recently published by the authors:

Fitri Maya Puspita, Evi Yuliza, Weny Herlina, Yunita, Rohania, "Improved Multi-Service-Reverse Charging Models for the Multi-link Internet wireless Using Bit Error Rate QoS Attribute", Science and Technology Indonesia, Vol. 5, No. 1, January 2020, pp. 6-13.

This paper is not listed among the references. The results presented in two papers are not identical but it seems that the theoretical setting is the same. If there are important differences, they are not clearly visible.

2. There are many errors in English usage; in many parts the paper is almost unreadable.

3. Conclusion does not actually conclude anything, it contains only a couple of general vague phrases without indicating key results.

Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

1. It is necessary to list the paper mentioned above among the references, and highlight the differences in approaches and results.

2. Conclusion should highlight the main results of the paper.

3. English usage should be improved.

Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

Title and abstract are the same. As for the list of authors, EDAS database, strangely, does not show it, so it is not possible to make the comparison.

Full paper review 3

Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.

Little (2)

Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.: completeness of the analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour.

Marginal work and simple contribution. Some flaws. (2)

Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.

Minor variations on a well investigated subject. (2)

Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.

Unacceptable. (1)

Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

In this paper, the problem of pricing scheme is investigated. A modification model is proposed.

Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

1. The proposed model is an integration of some existing modeds. The innovation is not explicitly shown in the paper.
2. The structure of this paper is so bad. There is lack of performance comparsion with other schemes in this paper.
3. There are some spelling mistakes.

Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

1. The structure of this paper should be improved to explicitly show the innovation, system model, and performance analysis.
2. Some spelling mistakes should be corrected.

Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

The title and abstract are the same.

Full paper review 4

Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.

Good (4)

Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.: completeness of the analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour.

Valid work but limited contribution. (3)

Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.

Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.

Readable, but revision is needed in some parts. (3)

Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

1. Paper is written reasonably well.
2. Figures may be used to depict with more clarity.

Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

1. Mathematical equations may be referred instead of giving them in detail if they are used from published literature.
2. Comparison with other methods in the literature could be included.

Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

1. Spelling of "schame" to be corrected in keywords section.

2. Page 1, 2nd para, line 2, Introduction section : Spelling of "deadling" may be checked and corrected.

3. Page 1, 3rd para: "formuates" check grammar/sentence formation.

4. Table 7 : Spelling of and to be corrected.

Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

Yes

Full paper review 5

Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.

Acceptable (3)

Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.: completeness of the analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour.

Solid work of notable importance. (4)

Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.

Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.

Well written. (4)

Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

The paper has important technical and presentation issues The proposed algorithm goods theoretical justification.

Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

- In general, the English language should be improved, and some sentences in the search should be re-drafted and arranged. You must clarify the relationship between the results of the new scientific contribution and improvement provided by research. The introduction section is not informative. The authors should provide more information on the existing works. How are those works related to this one? What are the major differences / advantages? It is the authors' responsibility to clearly define the novelty and research motivation. Meanwhile, the authors spent too many pages on repeating existing work in the main body of the paper. Apparently, the new material in the paper is not enough for journal publication.

Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

The references should be recent, especially in the introduction, and there is consistency with the current research. The references are outdated and unacceptable. Must be added Block diagram and Algorithm schema to explain the methods and equations. More discussion and analysis of the results and information shown in the tables.

Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

No

Full paper review 6

Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.

Acceptable (3)

Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.: completeness of the analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour.

Solid work of notable importance. (4)

Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.

Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.

Readable, but revision is needed in some parts. (3)

Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

In this paper, a modification model for single-link reverse charging of internet is formed on a multi-link network and on wireless network. The pricing scheme also takes into account the basic costs and quality of services provided by the service provider. Bit Error Rate (BER) was utilized as one of the well-known Quality of Service (QoS) attribute that can guarantee best performance for Internet Service Provider (ISP) and users.

Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

Too much mathematical notations in tabular form. More illustration of Eq. 2 is needed. Its better if comparison is shown using plots.

Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

So many typos. Please revise the paper for necessary changes to correct grammatical and spelling mistakes.

Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

Yes.

Full paper review 7

Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.

Acceptable (3)

Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.: completeness of the analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour.

Valid work but limited contribution. (3)

Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.

Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.

Unacceptable. (1)

Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

The author can simulate the optimization model for single-link reverse charging of internet by using the LINGO 13.0 program.

Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

The author should describe novelty of this research.

Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

The author should describe novelty of the optimization model using the LINGO 13.0 program.

Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

Yes.

Full paper review 8

Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.

Acceptable (3)

Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.: completeness of the analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour.

Valid work but limited contribution. (3)

Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.

Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.

Well written. (4)

Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

A modification model for single-link reverse charging of internet is formed on a multi-link wireless network. A valid method is verified to determine the base price.

Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

Determination of parameter and decision variables are based on previous models, base cost and quality premium. This paper mainly shows the validity of the existing methods in a local network. The novelty and practicability are limited.

Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

The representativeness of the local network can be described.

Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

Yes

Full paper review 9

Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.

Little (2)

Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.: completeness of the analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour.

Marginal work and simple contribution. Some flaws. (2)

Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.

Minor variations on a well investigated subject. (2)

Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.

Readable, but revision is needed in some parts. (3)

Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

The paper proposed a modification model for single-link reverse charging of internet, to address the multi-link network scenarios.

It takes into account the basic costs and quality of services (i.e., Bit Error Rate) in the model.

The model can be solved using the LINGO 13.0 program to gain optimal values.

Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

There is no real implementation and evaluation results.

It does not consider that the packet will re-transmitted if the data is corrupted.

Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

Better have some real implementation and evaluation.

And there're several typos, including "If deadling with wireless internet pricing ...".

Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

Not sure where to check. The attached file is a MS word file.

Full paper review 10

Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.

Acceptable (3)

Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.: completeness of the analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour.

Valid work but limited contribution. (3)

Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.

Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.

Readable, but revision is needed in some parts. (3)

Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

1- This paper included a proposal to improve previous work in term of QoS using virtual data. 2- The obtained results are achieved using LINGO 13.0 application software.

Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

1- I did not find any results in term pf BER as in the paper title. 2- The QoS must be measured by more than one parameters like delay and throughput. 3- The paper must be included a flowchart of your proposed algorithm. 4- There are some errors in writing and language, the paper must be reviewed language specialist.

Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

1- Please, clear out the problem that will be addressed in each abstract briefly and with some detail in introduction. 2- Write the abbreviations in a correct method, for example, put "(Internet Reverse Charing, IRC)" in "Internet Reverse Charging (IRC). 3- Change the title of section 2 from "RESEARCH METHOD" to "PROPOSED MODEL". 4- You must identify each symbol of equation (1) directly and put the rest of equations by some details.
5- In page 3, the statement "For 3 other cases, the formulation is (2)-(2m)" is not clear. 6- Put the sentence "Then next table show us" into "Table 4 shows..". 7- There are some missing in the statement " In Table 6 and 7, the same results occurs as in Table 5-Table 6.", please, rewrite. 8- It is clear that the results is started with Table 3, so, the parameters listed in table 1&2 must with their explanations must be put in section 2.

Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

I did not find the PDF version

Full paper review 11

Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.

Little (2)

Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.: completeness of the analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour.

Marginal work and simple contribution. Some flaws. (2)

Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.

Minor variations on a well investigated subject. (2)

Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.

Readable, but revision is needed in some parts. (3)

Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper

This paper presents a modification model for single-link reverse charging of the internet based on a multi-link network and wireless network. Bit Error Rate is utilized as one of the well-known QoS attributes that can guarantee the best performance for the ISPs and users.

Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

1/ Not sure if this method has been already studied by the ISP themselves. 2/ I believe ISPs should have their own optimal solution for the charging. How to verify this proposed method will be better than existing ones? 3/ It seems this method will only benefit the ISPs even if the authors claim that it is also guarantee the best performance for the users. Also, users may care more about the throughput rather than error rate. The error rate can be fixed by upper-layer protocols as well.

Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

May reconsider the benefit for the users; Too many tables. Need more descriptions for the solution and analysis; Writing should be improved.

Submission Policy: Does the paper list the same author(s), title and abstract (minor wording differences in the abstract are ok) in its PDF file and EDAS registration?

Yes

COMMENTS FROM EDITORS: GUIDELINES FOR REVISIONS

For ORIGINAL/RESEARCH Paper Type, the paper should be presented with IMRaD model:

1. Introduction (I)
2. The Proposed Method/Algorithm/Procedure/Framework/ ... specifically designed (optional). Authors may present complex proofs of theorems or non-obvious proofs of correctness of algorithms after introduction section (obvious theorems & straightforward proofs of existing theorems are NOT needed).
3. Method (M)
4. Results and Discussion (RaD)
5. Conclusion.

We will usually expect:

- A minimum of 25-30 references primarily to journal papers, depending on the length of the paper (number of minimum references = 2n+10, n=page length).
- Citations of textbooks should be used very rarely and citations to web pages should be avoided.
- REMOVE ALL LOCAL REFERENCES.
- All cited papers should be referenced within the text of the manuscript.
- Choose ONLY the most important figures and/or tables, and prepare all figures in high quality images.
- Avoid paper with too many Figures and/or Tables. Figures and Tables are each MAX 4 entries.

For REVIEW Paper Type, the paper should present a critical and constructive analysis of existing published literature in a field, through SUMMARY, CLASSIFICATION, ANALYSIS and/or COMPARISON. The function and goal of the review paper is:

1. to organize literature;
2. to evaluate literature;
3. to identify patterns and trends in the literature;
4. to synthesize literature; or
5. to identify research gaps and recommend new research areas. The structure of a review paper includes:

1. Title – in this case does not indicate that it is a review article.
2. Abstract – includes a description of subjects covered.
3. Introduction should be presented within 3-6 paragraphs, includes a description of context (ex: paragraph 1-3), motivation for review (ex: paragraph 4, sentence 1) and defines the focus (ex: paragraph 4, sentences 2-3)
4. Body – structured by headings and subheadings
5. Conclusion – states the implications of the findings and an identifies possible new research fields
6. References ("Literature Review") – organised by number in the order they were cited in the text. Number of minimum references for review paper is 50 references (included minimum 40 recently journal articles).

We would like also your cooperation with the double check of your revised paper:

---

(1) TEMPLATE- Please Strictly use and follow to the template Manuscript:

-- IJEECS: http://iaescore.com/gfa/ijeecs.docx (Word Format)

-- IJAI: http://iaescore.com/gfa/ijai.docx (Word Format)

-- IJERE: http://iaescore.com/gfa/ijere.docx (Word Format)

(2) Authors may present complex proofs of theorems or non-obvious proofs of correctness of algorithms after introduction section (obvious theorems & straightforward proofs of existing theorems are NOT needed).

(3) Introduction

For Research article: Introduction section should be presented within 3-6 paragraphs: explain the context of the study and state the precise objective. An Introduction should contain the following three (3) parts:

- Background: Authors have to make clear what the context is. Ideally, authors should give an idea of the state-of-the art of the field the report is about.
- The Problem: If there was no problem, there would be no reason for writing a manuscript, and definitely no reason for reading it. So, please tell readers why they should proceed reading. Experience shows that for this part a few lines are often sufficient.
- The Proposed Solution: Now and only now! - authors may outline the contribution of the manuscript. Here authors have to make sure readers point out what are the novel aspects of authors work. Authors should place the paper in proper context by citing relevant papers. At least, 15 references (recent journal articles) are cited in this section to explain gap of analysis and to support your state of the art.

For Review article: Introduction section for review paper should accomplish three things:

- Introduce your topic: It may sound redundant to "introduce" your topic in the introduction, but often times writer's fail to do so. Let the reader in on background information specific to the topic, define terms that may be unfamiliar to them, explain the scope of the discussion, and your purpose for writing the review.
- State your topic's relevance: Think of your review paper as a statement in the larger conversation of your academic community. Your review is your way of entering into that conversation and it is important to briefly address why your review is relevant to the discussion. You may feel the relevance is obvious because you are so familiar with the topic, but your readers have not yet established that familiarity.
- Reveal your thesis to the reader: The thesis is the main idea that you want to get across to your reader. your thesis should be a clear statement of what you intend to prove or illustrate by your review. By revealing your thesis in the

introduction the reader knows what to expect in the rest of the paper.

(4) Method section: the presentation of the experimental methods should be clear and complete in every detail facilitating reproducibility by other scientists.

(5) Results and discussion section: The presentation of results should be simple and straightforward in style. This section report the most important findings, including results of statistical analyses as appropriate and comparisons to other research results. Results given in figures should not be repeated in tables. This is where the author(s) should explain in words what he/she/they discovered in the research. It should be clearly laid out and in a logical sequence. This section should be supported suitable references.

(6) (URGENT)!!! About Figures & Tables in your manuscript:

- Because tables and figures supplement the text, all tables and figures should be REFERENCED in the text. **Authors MUST EXPLAIN what the reader should look for when using the table or figure**. Focus only on the important point the reader should draw from them, and leave the details for the reader to examine on her own.
- Tables are to be presented with single horizontal line under: the table caption, the column headings and at the end of the table. All tables are produced by creating tables in MS Word. Captured tables are NOT allowed.
- All figures MUST in high quality images

(7) Conclusion section: Summarize sentences the primary outcomes of the study in a paragraph. Are the claims in this section supported by the results, do they seem reasonable? Have the authors indicated how the results relate to expectations and to earlier research? Does the article support or contradict previous theories? Does the conclusion explain how the research has moved the body of scientific knowledge forward?

(8) Most importantly, **please ensure the similarity score is less than 25%**. You can refer to EDAS to see the similarity score of your paper. **Any paper with a similarity score of more than 25% will be dropped**. Please make sure your revised paper follow this rule. If the similarity score of final version is more than 25%, the Editors has the right to cancel the paper to be published in one of our Scopus indexed journals.

(9) Please ensure the maximum page of your final paper is 8-page, but still allowed up to 12 pages (for research article) and 14 pages (for review article), but required to pay an extra fee after 8 pages (USD50 per page).

---

ts@ee.uad.ac.id <ts=ee.uad.ac.id@edas.info>   Sat, Dec 5, 2020 at 10:46 AM
Reply-To: ts@ee.uad.ac.id
To: Fitri Maya Puspita <pipitmac140201@gmail.com>
Cc: esperg@ee.uad.ac.id

[Quoted text hidden]

---

ts@ee.uad.ac.id <ts=ee.uad.ac.id@edas.info>   Sat, Dec 5, 2020 at 11:09 AM
Reply-To: ts@ee.uad.ac.id
To: Fitri Maya Puspita <pipitmac140201@gmail.com>
Cc: Angelo Bruno <angelo.bruno@ieee.org>, Noriko Etani <kerotan@kcn.ne.jp>, Kai Liu <liukai.v@gmail.com>, Mahmood Mosleh <drmahmoodfarhan@gmail.com>, Ali Nahar <alikareemnahar79@gmail.com>, "Alexander B. Sergienko" <sandy@ieee.org>, Dhiraj Sunehra <dhirajsunehra@yahoo.co.in>, Baohua Yang <yangbaohua@gmail.com>, Yingjie Zhang <superzyj001@qq.com>, Qi Zhao <qi.zhao@cs.ucla.edu>, esperg@ee.uad.ac.id

[Quoted text hidden]

---

ts@ee.uad.ac.id <ts=ee.uad.ac.id@edas.info>   Sat, Dec 5, 2020 at 12:34 PM
Reply-To: ts@ee.uad.ac.id
To: Fitri Maya Puspita <pipitmac140201@gmail.com>
Cc: esperg@ee.uad.ac.id

-- LAST REMINDER !!! -- UPLOAD YOUR FINAL MANUSCRIPT AND VIDEO PRESENTATION (NOT PPT/PPTX)

[Quoted text hidden]

Intelektual Pustaka Media Utama

iaes Institute of Advanced Engineering and Science

CERTIFICATE

No: 23945/IJEECS/A/07/2021

Indonesian Journal of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science

is hereby awarding this certificate to

Fitri Maya Puspita, Rohania Rohania, Evi Yuliza, Wenny Herlina, Yunita

as *Authors* for paper entitled:

Models of improved multilink reverse charging network by utilizing the bit error rate QoS attribute

for Vol. 22, No. 1, April 2021

Yogyakarta: Jul 21, 2021

Tole Sutikno
Managing Director, Journals